



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/769,943      | 01/26/2001  | Christopher M. Jagers | M-8783 US           | 5515             |

7590 01/20/2004

David L. Combs  
Haynes and Boone, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, TX 75202-3789

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LELE, TANMAY S

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2684

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/769,943

Applicant(s)

JAGGERS ET AL.

Examiner

Tanmay S Lele

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "Figure 1" (page 5, line 15 for example). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "22" has been used to designate both "cradle" and "display." A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "30" in Figure 1B. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "40" and "28" in Figure 1C. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 –4, 15, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031).

Regarding claim 1, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a cellular telephone (Figure 1b), the docket station comprising: a support structure including a first surface on which is disposed a display device and a cradle (Figure 1b and column 3, lines 3 –5 and column 4, lines 2 –7); a station power source (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 28 –32); charging means coupled to the station power source for charging the station power source (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 28 –32); a first connector assembly for coupling the station power source to an external source of electrical energy (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 28 –32); a second connector assembly coupled to the charging means for selectively coupling the charging means to the cellular telephone for charging the cellular telephone (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –52); and a switch for selectively coupling the station power source to the cellular telephone when the cellular telephone is positioned in the docking station (Figure 1b and 2a and column 4, lines 65 –67).

Regarding claim 2, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communication device (Figure 1b), the docking station comprising: a docking housing having a planar first surface (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 24 –27); a display device mounted on the planar surface

Art Unit: 2684

(Figure 1b and column 3, line 3 –5); cradle means for supporting the wireless communication device, the cradle means disposed on the docking housing (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 2 –7); a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –51); an internal voltage source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32); a charging circuit for charging a voltage source (Figure 2b and column 4, lines 28 –32); and a switch for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal voltage source (Figure 2b and column 4, lines 48 –57 and column 4, lines 65 –67).

Regarding claim 3, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Helstab further teaches of wherein the connector comprises a first terminal coupled to the internal voltage source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –54).

Regarding claim 4, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 3. Helstab further teaches of wherein the connector comprises a second terminal selectively coupled to the charging circuit through the switch (column 4, lines 48 – 53 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Regarding claim 15, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Helstab further teaches of further comprising means for determining whether a wireless communications device is docked at the station and for providing status information as a result of the determination (column 4, lines 21 –27).

Regarding claim 31, Helstab teaches of a method for using a wireless communication device (Figure 2a), the method comprising: mounting the wireless communications device on a docking station that comprises: (g) a cradle for the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 2 –9), (h) a display device (column 3, lines 3 –5), (i) a connector for effecting an electrical interface to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 47 –54),

Art Unit: 2684

(j) a station power source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32), (k) a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 –62 and column 5, lines 26 –35), and (l) a switch operable in response to information indicating whether or not a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (column 4, lines 65 – 67); causing the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communications device (column 2, lines 13 –15); and causing, in response to information that the wireless communication device is docked at the station, the charging circuit to charge the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 47 – 54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Regarding claim 32, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 31. Helstab further teaches of further comprising: using the docking station in a portable mode; and continuing to cause the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communication device and to cause the charging circuit to charge the wireless communication device (column 4, lines 47 – 54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 27 –32).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Uchiyama (Uchiyama, US Patent Application No. 2002/0072390).

Regarding claim 5, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 4.

Art Unit: 2684

Helstab does not specifically teach of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's charging system, Uchiyama's circuit topology, for the purposes of current flow (and therefore charging), as taught by Uchiyama.

Regarding claim 6, Helstab in view of Uchiyama, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 5. Uchiyama further teaches of wherein the first terminal is for selective coupling to a B+ bus in the wireless communication device and the second terminal is for coupling to a wireless communication device voltage source (paragraph 0038).

9. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) as applied to claims 4 and 15 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 7, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 4. Helstab does not specifically teach of wherein the switch has a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to the first terminal of the connector (though it should be noted that in presence detected, as per column 4, lines 65 –67 and column 6, line 48 – 53).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch has a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to

Art Unit: 2684

the first terminal of the connector (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 – 19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purposes of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 8, Helstab in view of Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the switch has a second terminal selectively coupled to the second terminal of the connector (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 – 53 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 – 19).

Regarding claim 10, Helstab in view of Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Obata further teaches of wherein when a wireless communication device is positioned in the docking station, the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the second terminal of the connector so as to enable the charging circuit to charge the wireless communication device voltage source (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

Regarding claim 11, Helstab in view of Obata teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53).



Helstab and Obata do not specifically teach of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 16, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 15. Helstab further teaches of wherein the switch is operable in a response to status information to selectively couple the charging circuit to a power source of the wireless communications device when a wireless communications device is docked (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Helstab does not specifically teach of to selectively couple the charging circuit to the station power source when a wireless communications device is not docked (though mention of a battery operated base is made in column 4, lines 30 –32).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or not fully charged), for the purposes of

Art Unit: 2684

charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Uchiyama (Uchiyama, US Patent Application No. 2002/0072390).

Regarding claim 9, Helstab in view of Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Obata further teaches of wherein the first terminal is for selective coupling to a B+ in the wireless communication device and the second terminal is for coupling to a wireless communication device voltage source (column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

Helstab in view of Obata does not specifically teach of a bus.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of a bus (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's charging system, Uchiyama's circuit topology, for the purposes of charging, as taught by Uchiyama.

11. Claim 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 12, Helstab teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2.

Helstab does not specifically teach of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Regarding claim 13, Helstab in view of Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Both Helstab and Freadman teach of wherein when a wireless communication device is positioned in the docking station, the switch is operable to couple the charging circuit to the wireless communication device voltage source so as to enable the charging circuit to charge the wireless communication device voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8).

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 14, Helstab in view of Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 13. Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein the switch operates to

Art Unit: 2684

couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8).

Helstab and Freadman do not specifically teach of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Freadman, and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 17, Helstab in view of Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 16. Helstab in view of Obata, do not specifically teach of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video

Art Unit: 2684

signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

14. Claims 18 –21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 18, Helstab teaches of in a docking station for a wireless communications device (Figure 2a), an apparatus for selectively supplying power to the communications device (Figure 2a), the apparatus comprising: a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the communications device (Figure 2a; column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67), the connector having at least first and second terminals (Figure 2a; column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station (Figure 2a; column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 21 –27); a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 –32); a station power source coupled to the first terminal of the switch (Figure 2a, column 4, lines 28 –32); and means for determining whether a communication device is docked at the station and for providing status information as a result of the determination (column 4, lines 19 –27).

Helstab does not specifically teach of a switch having a pole, a first terminal, and a second terminal, [a charging circuit] coupled to the pole of the switch, and [a station power source] (though it should be noted a charging system is noted in column 4, lines 28 –32).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of a first terminal (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19), and a second terminal (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19 and column 18, lines 30 –42); and [a charging circuit] coupled to the pole of the switch (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purposes of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 19, Helstab in view of Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 18. Both Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the first terminal of the switch is electrically coupled to the first terminal of the connector and the second terminal of the switch is electrically connected to the second terminal of the connector Helstab: column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 19 and column 18, lines 30 – 42).

Regarding claim 20, Helstab in view of Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Helstab further teach of wherein the switch operates to connect the pole terminal to the first terminal in response to status information indicating that a communications device is not docked at the docking station (column 4, lines 21 –27 and column 2, lines 13 –15)

Helstab in view of Obata do not specifically teach of whereby the charging circuit then charges the station power source (though both have internal power supplies; Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 47 –48).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 21, Helstab in view of Obata teach all claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Both Helstab and Obata teach of wherein the second terminal of the connector is configured to be coupled to the wireless communications device power source when the device is docked (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, line 65 –67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 18) and wherein the switch operates to connect the pole terminal to the second terminal of the switch in response to status information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, line 65 –67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 18).

Helstab in view of Obata do not specifically teach of whereby the charging circuit then charges the wireless communications device power source (though both have internal power supplies; Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 47 –48).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

15. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 22, Helstab teaches of a method of enhancing the capabilities of a wireless communications device for information acquisition applications (Figure 2a), the method comprising the steps: mounting the wireless communications device on a docking station (Figure 2a) that comprises: (a) a cradle for the wireless communications device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 2 –7), (b) a display device (column 3, lines 3 –5), (c) a connector for effecting an electrical interface to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –54), (d) a station power source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32), (e) a charging circuit (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32 and column 5, lines 29 –31), and (f) a switch operable in response to information indicating whether or not a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); causing the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); and causing, in response to information that the wireless communication device is docked at the station, the charging circuit to charge the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 21 –32).

Helstab does not specifically teach of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).



It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

16. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 23, Helstab in view of Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 22. Both Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein, in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station, the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 28 –32, column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8),

Helstab and Freadman do not specifically teach of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station, the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Freadman, and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

17. Claims 24, 25, and 28 –30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 24, Helstab teaches of an assembly for docking a wireless communication device (WCD) so as enhance the capabilities of the device (Figure 2a), the assembly comprising: a housing having a receptacle for the WCD (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 47 – 51); an enhanced display device (column 3, lines 3 – 5); an internal chargeable power source (column 4, lines 28 – 32); a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 – 32); switch means, responsive to a predetermined status of the assembly (column 4, lines 65 – 67); detachable means for coupling the charging circuit to a source of electrical power (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 – 32); a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the WCD (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 – 54); and a support for the housing (Figure 2a and column 1, lines 65 – 67 and column 5, lines 53 – 55).

Helstab does not specifically teach of for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source; a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the enhanced display device; and an enhanced display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the enhanced display device (column 3, lines 54 –63); and an enhanced display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Helstab in view of Freadman do not specifically teach of for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53 and column 18, lines 30 –42).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Freadman's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 25, Helstab in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein the enhanced display device is mounted on a planar surface of the housing (Helstab: column 5, lines 44 – 49 and Freadman: column 3, lines 56 –63).

Regarding claim 28, Helstab in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 25. Helstab further teaches of wherein the detachable means

Art Unit: 2684

includes a line cord and a plug for insertion into an AC outlet (column 4, lines 28 –32; Figure 2a; column 5, lines 26 –35).

Regarding claim 29, Helstab in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Helstab and Obata do not specifically teach of wherein the switch is operable in a response to status information to selectively couple the charging circuit to the station power source when a WCD is not docked and to selectively couple the charging circuit to a power source of the WCD when a WCD is docked (though mention of a battery operated base is made in column 4, lines 30 –32 in Helstab and column 17, lines 47 – 48 and column 18, lines 30 –43).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Freadman, and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or not fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 30, Helstab in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 29. Both Helstab and Obata further teach of further comprising a connector for effecting an electrical connection between the assembly and the WCD, the connector comprising a first contact coupled to the internal chargeable power source and a second contact coupled to the switch means (Helstab: column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 19 and column 18, lines 30 – 42).

18. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262)

and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 25 above Kobayashi (Kobayashi, UP Patent No. 4,776,553).

Regarding claim 26, Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 25. Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion (Figures 1 – 10 and column 1, lines 40 –50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Regarding claim 27, Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 26. Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing (Figures 1 – 10 and column 1, lines 40 –50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Art Unit: 2684

***Citation of Pertinent Prior Art***

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:


| Inventor      | Publication | Number    | Disclosure  |
|---------------|-------------|-----------|---|
| Nojima et al. | US Patent   | 6,336,038 | Information Terminal Device and Control Method for the Same |

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

  
Tanmay S Lele  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2684



tsl  
October 20, 2003